This is in response to the Office Action dated December 8, 2009. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejection and further examination are requested.

Initially, it is noted that the Examiner has objected to claim 11 because it ends with a "semicolon" and not a "period". Claim 11 has been amended to address the objection. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw the objection.

The Examiner has asserted that claims 10 and 12 set forth the same species as non-elected claims 4 and 6. As a result, the Examiner has withdrawn claims 10 and 12 from consideration.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a):

Claims 7-9 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahamparam (US Pub. 2003/013599) in view of Wolfberg (US 5,214,579). This rejection is submitted to inapplicable to the above claims, as amended, for the following reasons.

Claim 7 recites a method of managing a particular project of a project holder that holds a plurality of projects, including, in part, operating, by the trustee, a computer system comprising a credit management program for managing money invested by an investor with respect to the particular project, a payment management program for managing money spent for activities of the particular project and money obtained from the activities of the particular project, and a dividend management program for managing dividends with respect to the particular project; wherein the payment management program calculates, with respect to the particular project, the amount of a dividend reserve by subtracting the amount of the money spent from the activities of the particular project from the amount of the money obtained from the activities of the particular project, and inputs the amount of the dividend reserve to the dividend management program, and the dividend management program calculates, with respect to the particular project, the amounts of the dividends on the basis of the input the amount of the dividend reserve.

According to the above features as recited in claim 1, an investor is able to invest money into a company based on his expectation of success in a particular project within the company. When the investor invests in a particular project, the investor's return will be based only on the

particular project in which he invested. Thus, even if a company had multiple other projects that failed (i.e., lost money), the investor's investment in the particular project will not be affected by the other failed projects. The combination of Ahamparam and Wolfberg fails to disclose the above features as recited in claim 7.

Ahamparam discloses a system for managing a particular project. However, the system disclosed in Ahamparam is designed to manage a particular project for a company. As such, the system of Ahamparam facilitates obtaining maximum value from a project regardless of where a company is in the project life cycle and includes methods for increasing the value that is received from top-tier projects and reducing the waste and rework (see paragraph 6).

Thus, Ahamparam discloses a system that allows companies to maximize their value from given projects. However, Ahamparam does not disclose how a dividend, based only a particular project, should be paid to an investor, based on the investor's investment in the particular project. Therefore, Ahamparam does not disclose or suggest operating, by the trustee, a computer system comprising a credit management program for managing money invested by an investor with respect to the particular project, a payment management program for managing money spent for activities of the particular project and money obtained from the activities of the particular project, and a dividend management program for managing dividends with respect to the particular project; wherein the payment management program calculates, with respect to the particular project, the amount of a dividend reserve by subtracting the amount of the money spent from the activities of the particular project from the amount of the money obtained from the activities of the particular project, and inputs the amount of the dividend reserve to the dividend management program, and the dividend management program calculates, with respect to the particular project, the amounts of the dividends on the basis of the input the amount of the dividend reserve, as recited in claim 7. Wolfberg also fails to disclose or suggest the above features of claim 7.

Wolfberg discloses a system for managing projects in a company. Specifically, Wolfberg discloses a data processing system which manages, monitors, and reports the growth of a participant's investment base with respect to progress towards achieving a predetermined target amount selected by the participant. The growth of the participant's initial investment is tracked and interpreted based on criteria and projections which reflect how well the account is

progressing towards achieving the target amount.

Thus, Wolfberg discloses deciding a dividend on the basis of multiple projects performed in one fiscal year within the same company, including both failed and successful projects. However, Wolfberg does not disclose how a dividend, based only a particular project, should be paid to an investor, based on the investor's investment in the particular project. Therefore, Wolfberg does not disclose or suggest operating, by the trustee, a computer system comprising a credit management program for managing money invested by an investor with respect to the particular project, a payment management program for managing money spent for activities of the particular project and money obtained from the activities of the particular project, and a dividend management program for managing dividends with respect to the particular project; wherein the payment management program calculates, with respect to the particular project, the amount of a dividend reserve by subtracting the amount of the money spent from the activities of the particular project from the amount of the money obtained from the activities of the particular project, and inputs the amount of the dividend reserve to the dividend management program, and the dividend management program calculates, with respect to the particular project, the amounts of the dividends on the basis of the input the amount of the dividend reserve, as recited in claim 7.

Accordingly, no obvious combination of Ahamparam and Wolfberg would result in, or otherwise render obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the features recited in claim 7. Therefore, claim 7 is patentable over the combination of Ahamparam and Wolfberg.

Claims 8-9 and 11 are either directly or indirectly dependent on independent claim 7. Therefore, claims 7-9 and 11 are allowable over the combination of Ahamparam and Wolfberg.

Because of the above-mentioned distinctions, it is believed clear that claims 7-9 and 11 are allowable over the references relied upon in the rejection. Furthermore, it is submitted that the distinctions are such that a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would not have been motivated to make any combination of the references of record in such a manner as to result in, or otherwise render obvious, the present invention as recited in claims 7-9 and 11. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 7-9 and 11 are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. The examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that there are more issues remaining which must be resolved before allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Nobuo OYAMA

/Allen N. Doyel/
By: 2010.03.08 17:18:25 -05'00'
Allen N. Doyel
Registration No. 60,391
Attorney for Applicant

AND/JRF/ats
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
March 8, 2010